DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 835 HE 002 076

TITLE	Function, Scope, and Structure of Higher Education in Connecticut. Report of Task Force II to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Higher Education, Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Objectives, Organization, *Public Education, *Responsibility, *State Government
IDENTIFIERS	*Connecticut

ABSTRACT

The mission of Task Force II was to examine the function, scope, and structure of higher education in Connecticut, including: (1) an analysis of the extent of the State's responsibility for providing education beyond high school; (2) identification of organizations or institutions that would be responsible for offering different level programs and to whom they should be accountable; (3) ways in which the educational system can best serve the State's needs in higher education through teaching, research, and service; and (4) ways to improve interinstitutional cooperation. This report presents: (1) the Task Force assignment; (2) Task Force members; (3) a summary of recommendations; (4) a discussion of the creation of the Task Forces of higher education in the State, including a description of public higher education's 5 subsystems, and of the growing cooperation between the State system and independent colleges; (5) a discussion of the Task Force's interpretation of the function, scope, and structure of higher education; (6) an examination of the Commission for Higher Education's role in higher education and recommendations regarding this role; and (7) the conclusion. (AF)

ED048835

FUNCTION, SCOPE, AND STRUCTURE

OF

HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

Report of

Task Force II

to the

Connecticut Commission for Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

December 1970

The Connecticut Commission for Higher Education wishes to express its gratitude to the Task Force members who prepared this report. In June 1970 the Commission established four Task Forces with broad representation from the educational, business and civic communities of the State. Each Task Force was asked to consider a different aspect of higher education. Their separate reports express the conclusions and recommendations of Task Force members exclusively. They are not necessarily the views of the Commission for Higher Education.

ED048835

December 8, 1970

Mr. Donald H. McGannon, Chairman
Commission for Higher Education
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. McGannon:

Attached please find the final report of Task Force II. The Task Force has reviewed its preliminary report submitted to you on December 8. While it has made editorial and informative changes, the Task Force remains confirmed in its recommendations concerning the function, scope, and structure of higher education in Connecticut.

The Task Force felt that given the magnitude of its charge and to best utilize the time and resources available, some task priorities had to be set. Accordingly, our report reflects an emphasis on the structure of higher education in the State. It should be clear that our work is to be construed as a point of departure. As we have stated previously, the Task Force submits this report in a spirit of beginning rather than finality.

Respectfully,

Samuel M. Brownell
Chairman

FOREWORD

This is the second of four Task Force reports on higher education in Connecticut. The reports are entitled:

I. NEEDS: SOCIO-ECONOMIC, MANPOWER, REGIONAL

II. FUNCTION, SCOPE AND STRUCTURE

III. FINANCING

IV. QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE PERFORMANCE AND ACHIEVEMENT

Each Task Force report contains a section that describes the development of the present State system of higher education. In the report of Task Force II, this background material appears in the first section beginning on page 1.

The charges to the four Task Forces from the Commission for Higher Education suggested subjects for possible consideration. They do not, however, limit the scope of the discussions. Task Force members were encouraged to make recommendations for any actions they felt would strengthen Connecticut's system of higher education.

A definition of Task Force II's assignment, a list of the Task Force members, and a brief summary of their recommendations follow. The complete report begins on page 1.

TASK FORCE II ASSIGNMENT: Function, Scope and Structure of Higher Education

1. Definition

In order to make higher educational opportunities available to meet the needs of individuals and of the State, it is imperative to reassess what constitutes higher education. Teaching, research, and service are three major functions identified for higher education. However, questions still remain as to which aspects should be offered under State supervision and/or auspices, and what structures assure a maximum return in quality and quantity of higher education. The dimensions of higher education continue to change. Thus the structure for assuring maximal delivery of opportunities needs continuous examination. While much of the structure grows out of tradition, reexamination and readjustment on the basis of new experiences become imperative.

2. Charges

A. Category A (Total Charge)

The Task Force should analyze and suggest possible alternatives for:

1. The extent of the State's responsibility for providing education beyond high school;

2. Identification of institutions or organizations and systems which should be responsible for offering programs in each of the following and to whom they should be accountable:

   a. Associate degree level
   b. Bachelor's degree level
   c. Graduate degree level
   d. Vocational-technical education
   e. Professional education
   f. Continuing education
   g. Equivalent college credit by examination administered state-wide
   h. Programs currently offered in proprietary institutions

3. Ways by which the educational system of the State can best serve the State's needs in higher education through teaching, research, and public service;

4. Future relationship between the Commission for Higher Education, the State Department of Education, and all public and private agencies whose activities inter-relate on higher education;

5. Future educational missions and governance of the respective constituent boards of higher learning, including recommen-

dations about a State-wide system;

6. Ways to improve interinstitutional cooperation with higher education and other institutions in such matters as the development of higher education centers, exchange of faculty, library services, foreign programs, etc.;

7. Consideration of educational innovations related to such matters as cluster colleges, freshman seminars, honors programs, programs for the disadvantaged, educational TV, work-study, etc.;

8. Possibilities of variations in the calendar in order to maximize use of the facilities.

B. Category B (Short-Range)

Within the total charges to the Task Force, and in addition to the general charges noted above, the following ad hoc needs exist:

1. Appropriate Utilization of the Resources of Private Higher Education Institutions in the State

Consideration must be given to the study mandated by the 1969 General Assembly regarding State relationships with independent institutions of higher learning. Steps for implementing this study are already underway.

2. Transfer Policy Recommendations

Since the inception of the Commission for Higher Education and with the growth of two-year colleges from three in number in 1965 to 10 in 1970, a major concern has been transferability of credit and articulation of programs between the two and four-year institutions of the State. An intensive analysis of this problem is already underway.

3. Open Enrollments, Access, and Admissions

A major educational, political, and individual concern to the general community is the matter of admissions requirements of the various institutions. This is especially important for those communities with a significant number of disadvantaged citizens. The extent to which access should be made available and the resultant impact on institutions are central concerns. An advisory committee is already at work, with representatives of public and private institutions, analyzing the in-state and out-of-state patterns, and making recommendations for future actions in Connecticut.

TASK FORCE II MEMBERS

Task Force II was composed of members from all parts of the State with varied backgrounds including teachers, administrators, students, leaders of civic groups, and businessmen who have contributed valued service to educational institutions and programs.

Task Force II members included:

Dr. Arthur C. Banks, Jr., President
Greater Hartford Community College

Dr. Samuel Miller Brownell
Consultant on Urban Education
Yale University (Chairman)

Mr. James Chesney, Student
Trinity College

Mr. E. Clayton Gengras
Chairman of the Board
Security Insurance Group

Mr. Peter C. Goldmark, President
CBS Laboratories

Mr. Carl N. Hansen, Vice President
Southern New England Telephone Co.

Mr. F. Don James, President
Central Connecticut State College

Mr. Lee Johnson, Former President
Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation

Mrs. John G. Lee, Vice Chairman
Board of Trustees
Connecticut College

Dr. John Patterson, Dean
University of Connecticut Medical-
Dental School

Mr. David Solomon, Student
University of Connecticut Law School

Mr. William Waller, Dean
Mohegan Community College

Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse, Director
Service Bureau for Women's Organizations

Task Force II consultant was Stephen J. Fischer. Early research for the Task Force was carried out by Henry Frantz of Southern Connecticut State College.

Task Force II would like to acknowledge the invaluable counsel offered by Robert O. Berdahl, professor of higher education, the State University of New York at Buffalo.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Commission for Higher Education should in cooperation with State higher education institutions establish short term and long term educational priorities for the State.

2. The Commission for Higher Education should take greater leadership in the evaluation of higher education in the State.

3. The Commission for Higher Education should in cooperation with State higher education institutions take leadership in seeing that clear and purposeful educational missions for the higher education institutions are established in terms of institutional capability and State need.

4. Communication between State agencies, State institutions of higher education, and the Commission for Higher Education should be improved.

5. The present structure for higher education in the State should not be changed until better assessment can be made of the higher education system's effectiveness in responding to the educational needs of the State.

CONTENTS

I. CREATION OF TASK FORCES 1

Higher Education in Connecticut 2
Regional Community Colleges 4
State Technical Colleges 6
State Colleges 7
University of Connecticut 7
Commission for Higher Education 9
Budget Planning and Coordination 11
Approval of New Programs 11
Independent Institutions 12

II. CHARGE TO TASK FORCE II 14

Structure as a Focus: The State Legislature 17
Structure as a Focus: The Commission for Higher Education 19

III. COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: TASK FORCE STUDY AND CONCLUSIONS 23

State Governance and Coordination of Higher Education 23
Some Pro's and Con's 25
Power and the Commission for Higher Education 28

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS 34

Task Force II Recommendations 34
Special Committee Recommendations 37

V. CONCLUSION 41

BIBLIOGRAPHY 43

I. CREATION OF TASK FORCES

> The CHE has the need by law and logic for the development of a plan which, subject to annual or systematic modification, could represent at any one instant the synthesis of policy, objectives and the fiscal and physical plans for meeting those objectives. (Robert J. Jeffries, Chairman, Fiscal Policy Committee of the Commission for Higher Education. Statement to Commission, May 7, 1970).

As a way of implementing quality planning the Fiscal Policy Committee of the Commission for Higher Education recommended establishment of four task forces whose general responsibilities would be:

(a) identification and collection of pertinent data,

(b) definition and consideration of alternative proposals, and

(c) identification of alternatives.

In addition, it was stated that,

> Each task force will be encouraged to address itself not only to those specific responsibilities initially assigned to it but also to those which it identified as a result of its own activity. In a time when higher education programs are being expanded rapidly, and when increasing demands are being placed on our institutions of higher education, a static charge to a task force would be unrealistic and would fail to utilize the anticipated potential of the group.

Membership of each task force was to consist of five to fifteen members to be drawn from higher education (administration, faculty, students), business and commerce, the professions, State agencies and communities. The Commission for Higher Education was to provide staff assistance.

Two basic areas of concern were directed to the attention of each of the Task Forces. These included long-range and short-range matters which were described as follows:

Category A - Long-Range Concerns are related to the sequential development of the State's system of higher education both public and private.

Category B - Short-Range Concerns are related to those items mandated by the 1969 General Assembly which must be completed for presentation at the time of the convening of the 1971 General Assembly. Some studies may also be completed by special committees and in-house activities of the Commission for Higher Education and can be intergated with the pertinent concerns of the task forces.

The four major topics of concern delegated as assignments to each of the task forces were identified as being consistent with the goals of the Commission for Higher Education after consultation with the constituent boards of the higher education system and the Advisory Council of the Commission for Higher Education, representing public and private institutions of higher learning in Connecticut. The areas are I. Needs: Socio-Economic, Manpower, and Regional; II. Function, Scope, and Structure of Higher Education; III. Financing Higher Education, and IV. Qualitative and Quantitative Performance and Achievement in Higher Education.

It is expected that the summer and fall deliberations of the four Task Forces may result in recommendations for legislative action as well as the identification of possible new directions in Connecticut higher education.

Higher Education in Connecticut

In 1964, the United States Office of Education, at the request of a commission appointed by the General Assembly, conducted a study of higher education in the State. The recommendations made in that report led in 1965 to the creation of a State system of higher education, a definition of the role

of the higher education subsystems including the Commission, and the establishment of a Community College System.

The Commission's efforts, since its inception, have been directed toward the significant and orderly development of the system, avoidance of costly and inefficient duplication of programs, and coordination in introduction of programs and institutions to serve the needs of the State and its citizens. A major responsibility carried by the Commission is to determine the needs of higher education in the State and how they best can be met through the total higher education system and the subsequent sponsoring of legislative programs and levels of support that will meet these needs.

Goals for higher education in Connecticut have been identified by the Commission after extensive discussions with the constituent boards of the public higher education system and the Advisory Council. They include the following:

1. To plan for and to coordinate higher education in the State and to stimulate among the constituent units of the public system and the independent colleges, long-range planning which will result in economically efficient and functionally effective programs of education.

2. To define, collect, and analyze data which are related to higher education and carried on by the staff of the colleges and universities in the State; and to report and communicate the aims, needs, and achievements of higher education in the State.

3. To make recommendations which will assist all colleges and universities in the State in obtaining the faculties, facilities, programs, and financial support which they must have to provide quality education.

4. To participate in the development of educational standards and to test college performance in relation to these standards.

The Commission published and distributed general goals defining long-range objectives for publicly and privately supported higher education

in the State. These are:

1. To insure that no student in Connecticut who is qualified or qualifiable and who seeks higher education be denied the opportunity for such education because of his social, ethnic, or economic situation.

2. To protect essential freedoms in the institutions of higher education.

3. To provide opportunities for a liberal education and for preparing to serve the State's economic, cultural, and educational development.

4. To develop the most effective use of available resources in public and independent institutions of higher education and thus obtain the greatest return on the public investment.

5. To maintain quality standards which will insure a position of national leadership for Connecticut's institutions of higher learning.

6. To assist in bringing the resources of higher education to bear upon the solution or abatement of society's problems.

The Commission for Higher Education is one of the five subsystems in the Connecticut system of public higher education. It acts with Boards of Trustees of the other four subsystems to coordinate planning and to assist in their relationship with agencies whose activities affect higher education. It is the desire of the Commission for Higher Education to achieve the proper balance between institutional autonomy and coordinated operations. Generally speaking the mission of each of the four subsystems can be explained as follows:

Regional Community Colleges

The present State system consists of 10 community colleges. The first three colleges were founded by the interest and efforts of community leaders. Subsequently Public Act 330 made possible the incorporation of these three colleges into a Regional Community College system and provided for the

establishment of additional two-year community colleges.

> They have a responsibility to offer courses of instruction for academic credit leading to the associate degree. In addition to programs of study for college transfer, this level of instruction includes career oriented programs designed to prepare individuals for the variety of specialized vocations that the growing complexity of Connecticut's economic environment demands. In addition,the responsibility of the Regional Community Colleges extends to the offering of courses of instruction at the transitional level for high school graduates preparing for work at the degree-credit level. Such offerings at the transitional "pre-freshman" level include courses of retraining, continuing education, and community services.
>
> The role of the community college presupposes service to a region within commuting distance of its student clientele. Each of the institutions expects to provide facilities to support instructional, cultural and extra-curricular programs normally available in a comprehensive college of medium size. Dormitories, however, are not envisioned. (Board of Trustees, 1968)

Norwalk and Manchester established community colleges without State assistance in 1961 and 1963. Winsted made plans for a community college to open in September of 1965. Following incorporation of these three institutions into the Regional Community College System, guidelines for the further development of a community college system for Connecticut were developed by the Commission for Higher Education when it was established in 1965 by the State Legislature.

Additional colleges added to the system and recommended for approval by the Commission for Higher Education included:

Housatonic Community College Stratford	Licensed 3/1/67 to begin 9/67
Middlesex Community College Middletown	Given independent status 6/1/68
Greater Hartford Community College Hartford	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68

South Central Community College New Haven	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68
Mattatuck Community College Waterbury	Licensed 5/10/67 to begin 9/68
Tunxis Community College Bristol - New Britain	Opened in 9/70
Mohegan Community College Norwich - New London	Opened in 9/70

Three additional community colleges, not recommended by either the Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges or by the Commission for Higher Education were authorized in the closing days of the 1969 session of the General Assembly.

These were:

Northeastern Connecticut	To open after September, 1971
Northern Connecticut	To open after September, 1971
Ansonia - Bridgeport - Derby Region	To open after September, 1973

State Technical Colleges

Four State Technical Colleges were developed in the postwar years. Publicly-supported technical college education in Connecticut dates back to April, 1946, when the Connecticut Engineering Institute was organized in Hartford by the State Board of Education. Inaugurated as a pilot program in response to demands of Connecticut industry, the institute was to help fill the need for a new type of industrial personnel, the engineering technician. The Connecticut Engineering Institute functioned as a post-secondary institute for several years. Following the success of the program in Hartford, other institutions were founded in Norwalk (1961), Norwich (Thames Valley, 1963), and Waterbury, (1964). A fifth institution was authorized by

the 1967 Legislature for the greater New Haven area. By legislative action in 1967 (P.A. 751) the name was changed from institute to college, a separate board of trustees was established and the system became a subsystem of the public system of higher education in 1965.

> The purpose of these institutes is to prepare those technicians for immediate employment in Connecticut industry who need up to two years of college level instruction. (Board of Trustees, 1966)

State Colleges

Four State Colleges were created as normal schools in the years between 1850 and 1903. Degree granting privileges were extended in the 1930's and the names changed to State Teachers Colleges. In the 1960's, the institutions added graduate programs and additional curricula. Subsequently their names were changed to:

Southern Connecticut State College in New Haven

Central Connecticut State College in New Britain

Eastern Connecticut State College in Willimantic

Western Connecticut State College in Danbury

> As multi-purpose institutions of higher learning, the State Colleges recognize four interrelated functions: professional education, liberal education, graduate study and research, and public service. The major emphasis of the colleges is and will continue to be given to the professional preparation of teacher and other school personnel. Professional offerings have been extended to include education of nurses and the liberal arts and sciences program has increasingly grown in importance offering majors in the areas of the humanities, mathematics, the social sciences, the physical sciences, and the life sciences. (Board of Trustees, 1968)

University of Connecticut

The University of Connecticut was created by the Legislature in April,

1881, as the Storrs Agricultural School. Charles and Augustus Storrs, natives of Mansfield, presented the State with a gift of 170 acres of land and $6,000. In 1893, the General Assembly renamed the school Storrs Agricultural College and offered admission to women. Three other name changes occured: Connecticut Agricultural College in 1899, Connecticut State College in 1933 and the University of Connecticut in 1939.

At present the University has five lower division branches in Waterbury (1946), Hartford (1946), Stamford (1951), Torrington (1957) and Groton (1967). The Legislature provided for the expansion of Stamford to a four-year college division by September of 1971, although this proposal was opposed by both the University and Commission for Higher Education. No funds were specifically appropriated for this purpose.

Schools of Law, Social Work and Insurance have been created in Hartford. In 1961, a Medical-Dental School and Health Center were authorized in Farmington. Although the facility is still under construction, the first class of 48 students was admitted in September, 1968. When facilities have been completed, and full classes admitted, 48 doctors and 48 dentists should be graduated annually.

> The University of Connecticut is charged with 'exclusive responsibility for programs leading to doctoral degrees and post-baccalaureate professional degrees.' The University must additionally provide undergraduate, pre-professional, first professional, and Master's degree work consistent with its particular responsibility for advanced graduate study, and such extension and service programs as are appropriate to the training and characters of its staff and to its facilities.
>
> The central point of emphasis of current planning efforts of the University is an institution of highest quality, with an internally complementary graduate and undergraduate program, on a scale that reconciles the

> requirements of quality with the State's quantitative needs. (Board of Trustees, 1965)

Commission for Higher Education

As the fifth subsystem in Connecticut's system of higher education, the Commission for Higher Education functions to coordinate planning of the other four subsystems and assists in their relationships with agencies whose activities affect higher education.

In carrying out its mandated responsibilities, the Commission for Higher Education attempts: (1) to secure for the State a maximum return on its investment in higher education, (2) to extend higher education opportunity for the State's citizens, (3) to create new resources to meet emerging higher education needs, (4) to provide information and assistance to higher education boards, institutions, and agencies and (5) to create a climate for the orderly development of the State system of higher education.

Under the provisions of Public Act 330, the Commission for Higher Education has 16 members, 12 appointed by the Governor and four appointed by the subsystem boards. Of the 12, one must be a representative of the State's private institutions of higher education.

Members presently serving on the Commission who were appointed by Governor John Dempsey are:

Chairman
Donald H. McGannon, President
Westinghouse Broadcasting Company
90 Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017 (1975)

John J. Driscoll, President
Connecticut State Labor Council
AFL-CIO
9 Washington Avenue
Hamden, Connecticut

The Reverend Edwin Edmonds
Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church
217 Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06511 (1971)

James F. English, Jr., Chairman
Connecticut Bank & Trust Company
1 Constitution Plaza
Hartford, Connecticut 06115 (1971)

Miss Anne M. Hogan
23 Tatem Street
Putnam, Connecticut 06260 (1975)

Miss Helen M. Hogan
306 Greenbriar Drive
Cheshire, Connecticut 06410 (1973)

Dr. Robert J. Jeffries
The University of Bridgeport
219 Park Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06602 (1977)

James J. Dutton, Jr., Attorney
22 Shetucket Street
Norwich, Connecticut (1973)

John R. Reitemeyer, Publisher
The Hartford Courant
285 Broad Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06101 (1977)

Orville J. Sweeting
108 Everit Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511 (1977)

Sister Mary Theodore
Mercyknoll
243 Steele Road
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117 (1977)

Alfred W. Van Sinderen, President
Southern New England Telephone Company
New Haven, Connecticut 06410 (1973)

The four representatives named by the subsystems are:

Merline D. Bishop
UAW - Sub-Regional Director
100 Constitution Plaza, Suite 500
Hartford, Connecticut 06103
(Rep. Board of Trustees,
University of Connecticut)

Henry E. Fagan
35 York Street
Stratford, Connecticut 06497
(Rep. Board of Trustees for
Regional Community Colleges)

Dr. Margaret Kiely
250 Myrtle Avenue
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604
(Rep., Board of Trustees, State Technical
Colleges)

Mrs. Bernice Niejadlik
Alexander Lake (Box 304)
Danielson, Connecticut 06239
(Rep., Board of Trustees, State
Colleges)

Alternates named by the institutions:

Alternate for Mr. Bishop
Mr. Joseph R. McCormick, President
The Hartford Electric Light Co.
176 Cumberland Avenue
Wethersfield, Connecticut 06109

Alternate for Mr. Fagan
Mrs. William Sale Terrell
2801 Albany Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117

Alternate for Mr. Fagan
Mr. Justin Glickson
202 Ponus Avenue
Norwalk, Connecticut 06850

Alternate for Dr. Kiely
Mr. Charles Phelps
Hebron Road
Andover, Connecticut

Alternate for Mrs. Niejadlik
Mr. John F. Robinson
The Robinson School
17 Highland Street
West Hartford, Connecticut 06119

The Commission does not operate the public institutions of higher education. This function is assigned by statute to the various Boards of Trustees. Its responsibilities include a number of major coordinating efforts of which the following are examples:

Budget Planning and Coordination

Public Act 330 requires the governing board of each subsystem to prepare a biennial budget request and to submit it to the Commission for Higher Education, together with such additional information as required. The Commission for Higher Education prepares a consolidated proposed budget for submission to the Governor and the General Assembly. Since the requests of the governing boards of the subsystems are included in the Commission's submission, the Commission's recommendations represent an additional assessment of individual subsystem and total system needs. In the past two biennia, the total amounts recommended by the Commission for Higher Education have fallen between the amounts requested by the subsystems and those appropriated by the General Assembly. The Commission, in both biennia, recommended an amount for each subsystem which it believed would provide for orderly progress and development, and an increment for improvement of quality as well.

Approval of New Programs

Since 1965, the Commission has been responsible for coordinating planning for higher education throughout the State. The Commission encourages individual governing boards to initiate plans for institutional development. The institutions are required to submit such plans to the Commission for approval. All institutions of higher learning, public and

private, have participated in and profited by the many studies of educational needs and existing programs that the Commission and other organizations have made.

Beyond its coordinating role, the Commission is also responsible for accrediting new programs. This activity is carried out in cooperation with the Connecticut Council for Higher Education and serves to insure the public of the quality of the programs offered.

The Commission also has leadership and coordinating responsibilities in programs for student financial assistance, in contracting for spaces for Connecticut residents in independent institutions, and in developing higher education centers.

Independent Institutions

There is also a growing list of areas of cooperation between the State system and the independent colleges. These institutions, while not officially part of the publicly supported State system, enroll a substantial portion of the college students in the State. They are faced with the necessity of planning for the future in a time when public institutions of higher education are undergoing rapid expansion and development. The Commission for Higher Education provides information to these institutions, involves them in planning activities, and makes every effort to insure that their contribution to the State will be maintained.

The first attempt by the Commission to seek greater utilization of independent colleges resulted in the enactment of P.A. 627 in 1969. This act provides that additional places in independent Connecticut colleges may be provided from public funds through contractual agreements with individual

colleges. According to the law, the amount of money per contracted place paid to the independent colleges shall not exceed the cost to Connecticut for educating a student in a comparable program in the public system. The act stipulates that 125% of the current tuition charged by the institution to students up to the cost per student in State supported institutions, be paid to the college for each additional Connecticut student it admits over a certain base year. The college agrees to use 100% of the tuition for Connecticut students in the form of financial assistance. The remainder may be utilized for its general expenses. The total appropriation made available for 1970-71 was $1,500,000.

With a grant from the Commission for Higher Education, An Analysis of the Financial Crisis of Private Colleges and Universities was completed in October, 1970, by Ward S. Curran, Associate Professor of Economics and George M. Ferris Lecturer in Corporate Finance at Trinity College. The report was presented to the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges for their consideration, and future developments are anticipated as a result of cooperative efforts between the Commission for Higher Education and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. A blue ribbon committee has been created by the Commission to provide counsel and advice to the consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston, as that firm studies the State's relationship to the independent colleges and universities within its borders. Efforts to preserve the viability of the private sector of higher education will be continued by the Commission for Higher Education as it recognizes the important contributions of the independent colleges and universities in Connecticut education.

II. CHARGE TO TASK FORCE II

The execution of the Task Force II mission -- to examine the function, scope, and structure of higher education in the State -- necessitated specification of particular charges to the Task Force for investigation. This charge, described below, was by no means inclusive but served to sharpen the focus of the Task Force. The Task Force soon recognized that such focus could not be attained unless some organizing principles and a framework for examination of issues were established. The first matter then was to develop working definitions of function, scope, and structure.

Function: It was agreed that the function of the higher education system of Connecticut is to make available post-secondary education to the fullest extent of the interests and abilities of those wishing to pursue study beyond the high school age or level of instruction. It is in the best interests of all citizens of the State that there be a system of higher education which seeks to offer to all beyond the high school age, or level of attainment, opportunities for development of their abilities.

It was further agreed that the function of a higher education system is primarily discharged through operations (1) which promote learning, such as teaching, research and other additions to knowledge, and (2) which promote the application and testing of knowledge in human affairs, science, and technology. Teaching was recognized as enhancing social and intellectual development and transmitting cultural values. Research was thought of as a process for creating knowledge and applying knowledge to existing social problems.

Scope: The Task Force has taken scope to mean the bounds within which

operations and activities operate to effect the fulfillment of the above noted functions. Higher education operations and activities are usually within an institutional setting and controlled by the nature of a program. Specifically, community colleges, state colleges, technical colleges, and universities are individual subsystems of Connecticut's higher education system of operations. Their respective activities are usually described by programs emphases, the degrees they grant, the breadth of their course offerings, and the characteristics of their student body as influenced by such factors as entrance requirements and tuition, full-time or part-time enrollment, and residence either at college or at home.

Structure: Structure is considered to denote the dynamic relationship between subsystems of higher education operations. A continuing theme of Task Force discussions has been that it was concerned with the structure of the total system of higher education for the State. No one institution in the higher education system should be viewed in isolation from other institutions. Structure considerations thus raised such questions as how relationships could best be established to enable knowledge and resources generated in any one institution, by virtue of the work of the students and faculty, to be available to and affect the work in other institutions. Such a dynamic relationship would, it is believed, enhance the achievement of maximum qualitative and quantitative return to the State from the total higher education system.

The Task Force recognized that these definitions must of necessity be construed only as agreements to add precision to Task Force thinking and reporting. To test systematically the validity and usefulness of the definitions, it became apparent that such an examination could at best be

incomplete. The issue was partially one of time constraints and magnitude of the problem. Furthermore, function, scope, and structure are intimately related matters. To examine each carefully by arbitrarily setting them apart would result in incomplete and artificial situations being examined. Thus, one who would attempt to evaluate the scope of a system of higher education must do so in light of its functions and structure. Mindful of this dilemma, the Task Force for this report decided to concentrate its attention on the structure of Connecticut's higher education system and particularly on the Commission for Higher Education.

Task Force efforts have proceeded on the basis of the following assumptions:

1. The above statement of the function of higher education is acceptable and adequately comprehensive.

2. The present scope of higher education in Connecticut as defined above -- i.e., the State's types of educational institutions though not necessarily its numbers of institutions or programs -- currently provides a practical base on which to move ahead for the fulfillment of these functions. Gaps and overlaps in the provisions for higher education in Connecticut, the indication of priorities as they relate to private institutional and individual initiatives and responsibility, and the presence of Federal, as compared with State, governmental activity in the higher education system require study beyond this stage of Task Force reporting.

3. The matter of structure as defined above, emphasizing a dynamic process of exchange and allowing institutions to complement each others efforts, should be the focus of this report of Task Force II. The operations within the higher education system are importantly influenced by the structure, for it is through structure that functions and decision making powers are allocated, regular and emergency communication relations established, and provisions made for prompt adjustment of conflicts.

It is perhaps appropriate before proceeding with a discussion of the structure of Connecticut's higher education system to note two conclusions

which arise from the study by the Task Force of the structure and operation of higher education systems in other states:

1. The present structure of the State system of higher education, when compared with the systems in other states, appears to provide their essential strengths and to avoid their major weaknesses.

2. Much of the effectiveness or lack of efficiency in the operation of state higher education systems seems to rest on the skills and attitudes of those who are in leadership positions in the state system. The Connecticut system of higher education is highly regarded nationally as much because of the quality of the leadership in the State system and the high degree of cooperative effort among the institutions to advance the total system of higher education in the State, as because of the structure of the system.

Structure as a Focus: The State Legislature

The Task Force recognized the important role played by the State Legislature in the State's system of higher education. Through its actions are provided the structure for planning, establishing, and operating public higher education institutions and operations. Through its appropriations are determined the scope and emphases of publicly supported institutions and programs. Through its policy determinations non-publicly supported institutions and programs of higher education can be influenced.

It is the responsibility of the Legislature to decide what the State, as an agency of the people, shall provide in order that the objective of equality of opportunity for higher education be realized. It carries out this responsibility through:

a. Seeing that planning is carried forward and by approval of plans;
b. Providing funds that enable plans to be carried out;
c. Evaluating progress of agencies and institutions;
d. Considering and modifying plans in the light of evidence.

The Task Force has examined the structure of the State system of higher

education with special reference to several objectives which it believes the Legislature should ensure in a structure for Connecticut's system of higher education. We would consider it desirable that the system provide:

1. An agency charged with the responsibility and supported adequately enough to provide objective, professional, and competent information and advice to the Legislature, institutions, and citizens concerning the needs, accomplishments, and efficiency of higher education in the State. Such an agency needs to be structured to ensure enough independence to resist pressures from partisan political or other special groups while maintaining sensitivity and responsiveness to needs of minority as well as majority groups.

2. Citizen representation on institutional boards which work with institutional staffs in the management and operation of State supported higher education institutions to assure sensitivity to higher education needs, the efficiency of institutional operations, and the total public interest.

3. A clear allocation of functions as between subsystems and institutions of the higher education system. Educational operations of the State would apparently profit from further clarification of responsibilities in the higher education field which now rest partially with the Commission for Higher Education and partially with the State Board of Education.

4. Continuous study of changing State and national conditions and their relationship to higher education plans.

5. Systematic and objective analysis and evaluation of the use of funds appropriated for higher education, of progress toward attainment of objectives, and of operating effectiveness of subsystems and institutions in the higher education system.

6. Leadership in cooperative efforts and activities of subsystems and institutions in the higher education system to bring about an effective total system, with coercive powers to effect cooperative study and objective analysis that is powerful in bringing about reasonable decisions commanding public support.

7. Freedom and incentive for all units, as responsible operating institutions, not only to be efficient in their operations but also to exercise their initiative and ingenuity to advance higher education within the scope of their allocated functions, and to propose for consideration any

changes in allocation of functions they believe are desirable for the total system of higher education.

8. Stability and continuity of financial support for programs long enough for them to become established and fairly evaluated. This is considered an important element in the ongoing efficient use of funds for higher education.

9. Responsibility for maintaining effective working relationships between higher education and the elementary and secondary systems of the State.

10. Responsibility for coordination and dissemination of information relating to student financial aid for higher education and for initiative in bringing about the most effective use of student aid resources.

11. Periodic review of policy regarding the subsidizing of costs of higher education particularly in the light of changes made in Federal aid policies, resources available to private institutions, and support which the family or the student may be expected to furnish on his own through work opportunities or loan programs.

Structure as a Focus: The Commission for Higher Education

Policy making in higher education involves the preservation of a delicate balance between the maintenance of institutional integrity, as seen by higher education institutions or subsystems of institutions, and responsiveness to total public need as set forth by the State. Harmonious maintenance of this balance falls by State mandate to the Commission for Higher Education. It was soon clear to the Task Force that the Commission walks a fine line in its efforts to maintain this balance and thus to contribute dynamic leadership to institutional initiative while at the same time providing objective judgment on institutional proposals as they relate to total State needs for higher education.

On the one hand some would like to see the Commission as a lobbying agent for the State's institutions of higher education. On the other, some

would like to see the Commission as an arm of the Legislature, controlling the direction, rate of growth, and operations of all higher education institutions in the State. It was agreed that neither perception is appropriate. The Task Force recognizes that objective presentation of higher education needs to the Legislature is appropriate for the Commission and that it will be influential in legislative action. Similarly, wise leadership by the Commission in the development of long range and short term plans for higher education in the State will influence the actions of institutions, subsystems, and State bodies as they make decisions concerning higher education policies and operations. Because of the importance of maintaining this delicate balance, the Task Force firmly advocates that the Commission for Higher Education constantly review its posture with respect to State agencies and institutions of higher education.

The Task Force emphasized that this review be systematically conducted with two essential factors in mind: 1. the nature and strength of the Commission's expertise and capability as a responsible agency representing higher education; 2. the extent and power of the Commission's influence in assuring the higher education system's responsiveness to public need.

The Task Force saw that higher education policy making can and has been affected by a host of influences from Sputnick to SDS to name but a few. It was agreed that no one variable is valid as a useful criterion except when applied in conjunction with other criteria. Thus efficiency, economy, manpower need, or simply one institution's concern for self-preservation provides an adequate basis for policy making only when considered along with other factors.

The concept of the public good was suggested as a means for assuring

that many factors would be taken into account when considering and reconsidering policy. This is useful as a basis for considering priorities for higher education, and such priorities should be in terms of short-term and long-term emphases. Today's public good could well be tomorrow's obsolescence.

A system of higher education is not buildings and bodies but what the system does as a whole. An education system is more than the sum of its parts; it is not simply a variety of colleges and universities. Important to a higher education system, then, is how the components work together to achieve some end. Achievement of public good is suggested as an essential aspect of that end.

The Task Force notes that responsiveness to public need is a criterion which each subsystem should consider carefully in determining the priorities of its programs and activities. Task Force II urges that determination be made as to how subsystems of higher education can best serve the public good through clarification and inter-subsystem articulation of their respective missions.

Reviewing the appropriateness of the assignments to the Commission for Higher Education in the structure of the State system of higher education we conclude that:

1. The Commission for Higher Education should be influential in establishing educational policy for the State that is based on priorities which will contribute to the well-being of the State. Such priorities should be set forth as short term and long term.

2. The Commission for Higher Education should, in cooperation with the institutions, determine how the subsystems of higher education in the State can best serve the public through clarification of their individual and collaborative missions.

3. The Commission for Higher Education should conduct regular reviews of its relationships with State agencies and the State's institutions of higher education. Such reviews should assess the strength of the Commission's expertise and capability and the extent of the Commission's influence in assuring the higher education system's responsiveness to State educational needs.

III. COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: TASK FORCE STUDY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Commission for Higher Education is crucial to the operation of an adequate and efficient system of higher education in Connecticut. Establishment of higher education policy implies a system-wide perspective. The Commission is the body in the State which can sensitively lend such a perspective. The criterion of public good, particularly where higher education is concerned, must derive from the same system-wide perspective. Interinstitutional cooperation -- its extent and nature -- can only be prompted from a point of view that is not predisposed toward any one institution or program. Here again the Commission by virtue of its mandate and indeed by its very composition, representing a variety of public and private sectors of the State, must play a critical role.

Having said all this, Task Force II considered whether such a global and objective posture was feasible. Raising this question led to an examination of "the state of the art" elsewhere. Specifically, the Task Force turned to an examination of governance and coordination of higher education in other states across the country. What follows is a brief summary of this examination including major arguments which emerged from deliberations of the group.

State Governance and Coordination of Higher Education

Three basic patterns of governance and coordination are found across the country. On a state by state basis, it is difficult to categorize very literally state systems into one of these patterns, but it is safe to say

that most states have a variation of one of the described patterns. In a very few states, these patterns do not apply at all.

The first pattern describes a single governing board for the entire higher education system of a state. This board is generally appointed by the governor with the approval of the legislature. The board is very directly involved in the operations of all institutions of higher education as well as planning for and coordinating parts of the system. It has the power to approve courses of study, set admissions standards, appoint faculty and officers, fix salaries, approve and provide for buildings, and award degrees.

A second pattern consists of separate governing boards for each institution which carries out the functions of the central board noted above, but within a general structure of central coordination at the state level. Such central coordination is exerted by a state agency which has various recommending and approving functions -- degrees, programs, budgets, etc. -- that while not necessarily binding on an individual institution do have considerable influence with any authority of final approval; for example, a state legislature.

The third pattern comprises governing boards for major sections of the higher education system but again within the structure of central coordination at the state level described for the second pattern. Specifically, subsystems such as state colleges, community colleges, technical colleges, and universities with university branches are under one governing board for the entire subsystem. This board, through an executive officer and staff, establishes policies and sets standards for the subsystem. These policies are then executed at the individual institutions within a subsystem through

institutional officers such as presidents. The latter generally do participate at the subsystem board level through a representative.

A look at the national scene shows that statutory or constitutional agencies have been established in approximately 40 states to coordinate overall planning for higher education. About seventeen of these are very directly involved in the operations of public institutions of higher education, having quite specific regulatory and governing powers.

Some 23 agencies which do not have governing power exercise varying degrees of control over planning and coordination, ranging from advising on programs and the planning of facilities to more direct influence such as approving programs, recommending budgets for legislative approval, and defining functions of institutions. Those states which have no formal statewide governing or coordinating agencies for higher education sometimes have either voluntary associations where ideas and data are compared, or loosely organized special advisory bodies dealing with such specific matters as facilities, medical education planning, or student financial aid.

In about 14 states, an official planning agency has some responsibility for private institutions in carrying out planning. In three states, private institutions must be included in any central agency planning, but participation by the private institutions is voluntary. Four states require representation from private institutions on the membership of the official state higher educational planning agency. In some five states, the state planning agencies have the authority to review planning and approve program changes for private as well as public institutions.

Some Pro's and Con's

There is no consensus as to which of the above alternatives is most

favorable to creating a higher education system that is both efficient and of high quality. Patterns do emerge, however, when considering arguments for or against particular options.

Two arguments are often used to support the use of a single governing board. Confusion of function or authority between individual institutional boards and a central state agency is much less possible. Highly centralized planning and administration protects the system from unnecessary program duplication and overlap of function between individual institutions.

Those who argue against the single governing board emphasize that such a body cannot be sufficiently sensitive to the needs and idiosyncracies of individual institutions. They argue that the currently increasing number and variety of higher educational institutions makes centralized administration untenable.

Those in favor of separate institutional governing boards within a structure of coordination note that this model usually involves a large number of lay, as opposed to professional, persons in program development. Lay representation at the institutional level helps to provide a balanced view that is sensitive to needs of the public. Also, individual boards are closer to the problems of their respective institutions and can assist in their resolution more speedily and with greater understanding than a central board. They can be held more strictly accountable than can a central board responsible for many institutions.

The arguments against separate institutional boards emphasize the dangers of splitting the system in such a way that these boards will feel compelled to compete for funds and status. It is argued that proliferation and duplication of programs will result from such competition. Furthermore,

there is the fear that institutional boards will be subject to undue pressures from the particular institutional community for creation of particular policies or programs.

Arguments favoring governing boards for major subsystems within a structure for state-wide coordination emphasize the need to consider the particular functions of whole subsystems of institutions so as to capitalize better upon their special capabilities and strengths. This argument points out that such strength lies not necessarily with, for example, one state college, but with state colleges considered as a whole. Furthermore, it is argued that this alternative facilitates sharing of resources within higher education subsystems, avoiding program duplication and effort. Efficient as well as effective program construction is thus facilitated and controlled.

Arguments opposing governing boards for major subsystems note that ambiguities over lines of authority and duplication of effort are created between such boards and any central coordinating agency. Such a system also fosters competition between subsystems for students and resources. Finally, one subsystem's influence might be so strong as to dominate and bias long-range coordinated planning for education in the state as a whole.

Given this background of alternatives and the issues surrounding their existence, Task Force II attempted to place the Commission in one of these alternative contexts and then assess how the above and other arguments applied to Commission operations. Fixing the Commission in one of the general descriptions was not too difficult. It was apparent that the Commission and other components of the Connecticut system of higher education comprise a setting describing governing boards for major higher education subsystems within a structure -- i.e., the Commission -- for coordination.

The responsiveness of the Connecticut higher education system in general and the Commission in particular to the various arguments raised for and against this alternative was not so apparent. Possibly the difficulty is due to the fact that the history of the State's higher education system as a system and the Commission in particular is too short to discern distinct patterns of conflict and responsiveness. Task Force II recognized, however, that the life of both had been of sufficient duration to warrant some effort at analysis. The Task Force took as its point of departure for this analysis consideration of the dimension of power -- specifically in the area of Commission operations.

Power and the Commission for Higher Education

Task Force II analysis of how the Commission for Higher Education should respond to higher educational "life" in Connecticut necessitated definition of the Commission's public. Furthermore, it was necessary to attempt some description of the Commission's relationship to that public.

The public of the Commission was broadly defined to include agencies of State government, public institutions of higher education, private institutions of higher education, and the general public. In order to assess the nature of the Commission's relationship to these constituencies, the Task Force discussed the Commission in terms of operational emphases. Specifically, should the Commission be primarily a planning and recommending body or more of a governing and directing authority? Should it as a matter of policy limit itself to informing the public in a "detached" fashion or should the Commission construe any informing function to mean being the strong proponent of a particular point of view?

The Commission as a recommending body was discussed in terms of operations including conducting studies on the best use of subsystems of the higher education system, recommending which types of institutions or groups of institutions might best achieve particular educational goals, providing background and advice on program design and facilities, and making recommendations concerning the State budget for higher education. As a governing body, its operations were reviewed in the possible roles of a unique advisor to the Governor and Legislature, sole representative of educational institutions to the Legislature, and as the final authority on institutional budgets, programs, and facilities.

The relationship of the Commission to public institutions of higher education as a recommending body was examined in terms of encouraging utilization of all possible resources, encouraging innovative practices and proposals, recommending and assessing programs in terms of State needs, and conducting research on how to meet institutional and State educational needs. As a governing body, the Commission was discussed in terms of being a controlling authority over program, over facilities development and final approval, and over all higher educational budgets.

The involvement of private institutions of higher education in the work and concerns of the Commission was examined primarily in the framework of the recommending function. The Commission was discussed in terms of inclusion of private institutions in discussions of new programs and facilities for the State higher education system, encouragement of private institutional participation in meeting State educational needs, encouragement of use of the private sector beyond only educational private institutions as part of any effort to mount educational programs, and providing fiscal

counsel and assistance where feasible.

The relationship of the Commission to the general public was scrutinized by looking at the Commission as first only a conveyor of factual information concerning educational costs, programs needed, enrollments, and other trends. The Task Force then looked at Commission information-dispensing operations as advocating positions on such matters as function of higher education, specific purposes of the various institutions, enrollment policies, determination of cost effectiveness criteria, and evaluation procedures and requirements.

It was clear to the Task Force that increasing the power of the Commission meant giving more weight to its governing potential than to its recommending potential. The impact on the State's system of higher education of making the Commission a more clearly governing body was accordingly examined.

It was seen that making the Commission the unique and final advisor on higher education policy to the Governor and Legislature must of necessity put the Commission in the position of being the sole executor of such policy. The Legislature could say to the Commission that inasmuch as it made the policy it should be responsible for carrying it forward.

A concern here was that such a posture would impair the Commission's planning role as an impartial coordinator and arbitrator of institutional policies, a role designed to foster institutional invitiative while remaining mindful of the needs of and economic constraints in the State. Furthermore, if the Commission was construed to be the sole representative of the institutions to the Legislature, could it not be seen as a blocking as well as facilitating agency?

Making the Commission the ultimate controlling authority over institutional programs and resources would, it was clear, make life easier for legislators and boards subject to pressures from communities and constituencies. They could react by saying that it was the Commission that mandated programs, and it was on the Commission that any pressures must be exerted.

The Task Force saw a primary danger, however, in making the Commission such a lawmaking body as well as a court of last appeal. Specifically, the operation of higher education institutions in the State as a system would be impaired. Institutions would have no reason to attempt to plan together, to endeavor to operate in somewhat complementary fashion, and to begin to pool energies in an effort to meet State needs. They would not feel compelled to regard themselves in the context of a working system because the Commission would be telling them what to do. Institutions would thus assume a relatively passive attitude, creativity and initiative would falter, and so the quality of higher education in the State would be jeopardized.

Given faltering enrollments and the financial plight of the private institutions, the Task Force saw that potential involvement of the Commission in the operations of these institutions was not as remote as might be assumed. For example, the current law (P.A. 627) granting State money to these institutions in order that they might take in more Connecticut students could be seen as a thrust in this direction -- a thrust that needed careful watching. Any desire of private institutions to be responsive to State needs, a desire very carefully nurtured by the Commission, could well be dampened if State assistance efforts were perceived as intruding on operational policies of private institutions.

Consideration of moving the Commission in the direction of assumption

of more power revealed an interesting dilemma in terms of its relationship to the general public. On the one hand, if the Commission were to assume more of an advocacy role, promoting very particular points of view by virtue of the information it chose to release, the public would have a right to be irritated and suspicious. It could ask whether it was getting a complete picture and opportunity to weigh the options and arguments. Conjecture could be raised as to what forces were acting on the Commission to influence its point of view. On the other hand, the Commission as a public authority on higher education is supposed to avail the public of its expertise; and expertise involves presenting convictions to the public as well as simply laying out information.

The Task Force saw that the effectiveness of the Commission rested on its courage to take stands while still informing the public. A crucial question thus emerged. Did the effectiveness of the Commission rest on its operational power? Put another way, was there a direct relationship between effectiveness and power?

The Task Force agreed that there was a relationship, but not one that might be expected. Power was seen as "servant" of effectiveness, serving to bolster and augment existing public confidence in the Commission. It was perceived that simply to grant the Commission more power would not make it more effective in dealing with its various publics as described above. The Commission would have to sustain itself <u>first</u> on the basis of the quality of its deliberations -- not solely on the basis of increased governing power.

It is with this emphasis that the Task Force proposes recommendations related primarily to the structure of higher education in Connecticut. Specifically, the Commission for Higher Education should continue to function

as a coordinating body, and that to be effective in this role the Commission must exert strong leadership. Furthermore, this leadership role must be substantiated by staff expertise and not simply by powers of enforcement and should give appropriate consideration to the integrity of institutions comprising the higher education system.

Finally, the Task Force asserts that the Commission must be free from partisan political control and conflict of interest between Commission members in order to operate effectively. Accordingly, care must be taken to assure that Commission membership always represents the variety of important elements in the State and that such representation be deliberately balanced.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Task Force II makes the following recommendations emphasizing: 1. structure as a focus, 2. particular attention to the Commission for Higher Education as a critical structural element, and 3. effectiveness--not power--as a point of departure in considering the interrelationship of the Commission and other subsystems of the higher education system and agencies of the State. The previously noted general recommendations will be listed below with specific recommendations relating to these general statements subsumed accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION I

The Commission for Higher Education should be influential in establishing educational policies for the State that are based on priorities which will contribute to the well-being of the State. Such priorities should be set forth as short term and long term.

a. The Commission should have the responsibility and leadership for ensuring that all institutions of higher education in the State are involved in the derivation of priorities to assure a program of planned educational coordination that is at once responsive to State needs while respecting the autonomy of the institutions.

b. The Commission should have the authority to collect information from all institutions having post-secondary educational programs in order to fulfill its leadership role in planning. This recommendation is made to strengthen present Commission practices of presenting information on the needs and performance of higher education to the public and State government agencies. The Commission should take further responsibility for communicating such information to the federal level.

c. The Commission must take care to maintain high quality standards for the information it dispenses but should not be constrained from making its point of view known in the process of making recommendations to the Legislature. The Commission

should not, however, presume to stand in the way of communication between the general public and institutions on the one hand and the Legislature on the other.

d. The Commission should take greater leadership in the evaluation of higher education in the State. Specifically, the Commission should encourage and assist institutions in self-evaluation programs and practices. Both the Commission and the institutions should be free to call upon each other in any effort to assess higher education in the State.

e. It is recommended that any higher education priorities established for the State not be narrowly construed to mean only responsiveness to immediate State manpower needs but that careful weight be given to consideration of education as a continuing and not a "one shot" process.

f. Task Force II recommends that the conclusions of the Task Force I study on State needs be carefully considered in any deliberations establishing higher education priorities.

RECOMMENDATION II

The Commission for Higher Education should, in cooperation with higher education institutions, determine how the various subsystems of higher education in the State can serve the public through clarification of their individual and collaborative missions.

a. It is emphasized that such determination be made in cooperation with the various higher education subsystems -- i.e., university, state colleges, community colleges, technical colleges -- taking into account such factors as State needs, institutional capability, articulation of efforts between subsystems, and potential for educational resource sharing.

b. The product of such a mission study should not simply be statements of broad goals stated in testimonial terms. It should reflect a hard and dispassionate look at the kind of student an institution really wants, the kind of faculty it wants and can pay for, and the kinds of programs it can do best by virtue of its students and faculty and resources. Task Force II does not accept the assumption that an institution can or should be all things to all people.

c. The mission study should raise and address itself to such questions as:

(1) Should community and technical colleges be merged?

(2) Should the University of Connecticut begin undergraduate education at the upper levels -- junior and senior years -- with the first two years of study offered only at its two-year branches?

(3) Should current two-year branches of the University become part of the regional community college system?

(4) Should doctoral programs be offered at the state colleges?

(5) Under what circumstances <u>if any</u> should two-year college programs be expanded to four-year programs?

(6) What is the place of post-secondary programs, such as proprietary schools, in state-wide higher education planning?

d. Recognizing the important contribution of private higher education to ensuring an effective and responsive state higher education system, it is strongly recommended that the Commission for Higher Education take a leadership role in assuring the involvement of private post-secondary educational institutions in any higher educational planning efforts. Accordingly, Task Force II urges private institutions to take an active part in such planning, providing all information and expertise needed to secure maximum education planning capability in the State.

A study by Arthur D. Little, Inc. on the relationship of the public and private higher education sectors is forthcoming and will be reviewed by the Task Force in terms of its implications for strengthening higher education in the State.

<u>RECOMMENDATION III</u>

The Commission for Higher Education should conduct regular reviews of its relationships with State agencies and the State's institutions of higher education. Such a review should assess the strength of the Commission's expertise and capability and the extent of the Commission's influence in assuring the higher education system's responsiveness to State educational needs.

a. The present structure of higher education should not be fundamentally altered until such studies are undertaken. It is felt that efforts made during the past five years to establish higher education as a system need to be assessed before any changes are deemed appropriate.

b. Those studies should be undertaken in cooperation with appropriate government agencies and the various subsystems of the higher education system and should work to foster a free flow of information concerning such matters as cost, program, admissions and enrollment, financial aid, and the derivation of laws pertaining to higher education.

c. It is suggested that a further study examine the expectations and perceptions that institutions and agencies, comprising and influencing the system, have of each other in order to assess whether: (1) such expectations are being met, (2) such expectations are realistic, and (3) whether misleading preconceptions are inhibiting productive relationships within the system.

d. The present structure of the Commission for Higher Education should not be fundamentally changed until such a review is completed. Task Force II bases this recommendation on its examination of other systems of higher education which indicate that the Commission currently is organized along lines that are considered best current practice. Again, it is felt that critical examination rather than change is a most appropriate course of action at this time.

e. If any change in the Commission should be immediately contemplated, it should be in the direction of facilitating further and more direct communication with the various institutions and agencies concerned with higher education in the State. Particularly, the Commission should work to consult with groups of faculty and students as well as institutional administration in order to have a balanced perspective and to benefit from expertise residing in the institutions that can serve to insure high quality Commission efforts.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are the result of the work of two special committees established by the Commission for Higher Education to study respectively transfer procedures and policies for extending educational opportunities to increased numbers of the State's youth. These recommendations

have not been specifically reviewed by Task Force II but are transmitted in this report as supporting the Task Force II statement of the function of higher education.

Committee on Transfer Recommendations

1. The Committee on Transfer of the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education recommends that all Connecticut institutions granting the bachelor's degree agree to accept in transfer academic degree credit earned by examination and awarded to students in colleges in the State provided:

   a. that such credit is awarded on the basis of duly recognized and nationally standarized examinations and

   b. that such credit is supported by information as to local norms for such examinations.

2. That all Connecticut institutions granting the bachelor's degree be invited to announce that priority among transfer applicants will go to Connecticut residents completing appropriate two-year programs at Connecticut institutions licensed or accredited to grant the associate degree and that eligibility for financial aid will be extended insofar as possible to such Connecticut transfer applicants.

3. That the principle of diversity within two-year and four-year institutions be confirmed as a positive value and that the process of transfer from two-year to four-year institutions take into account the broad goals of the first two years of the baccalaureate program and, hence, that senior colleges forego scrutiny of the specific scope and content of courses submitted for transfer credit except in cases where the scope and content of such courses bear meaningful relation to subsequent progress in the student's chosen field of specialization.

4. That support of the Commission for Higher Education be sought for development of a handbook on policies and procedures for college transfer and that provision be made for maintenance at some convenient location of a file of current information on opportunities for students transferring from two-year institutions in Connecticut.
5. That the Committee on Transfer be reconstituted as an "advisory committee on college transfer" to assist the Commission for Higher Education in maintaining a program of information and research.
6. That the Commission for Higher Education develop specifications for an annual summary or report on the transfer of students from Connecticut's two-year institutions of higher education.

Extended Educational Opportunity Committee Recommendations

1. Existing extended educational opportunities programs at the separate, individual institutions should be encouraged and supported financially.
2. The Commission for Higher Education should coordinate these separate programs, defining the most appropriate roles for institutions, and establishing a State-wide plan with the public two-year institutions as the key institutions.

The Committee wishes to point out the following facts as important to the implementation of the basic recommendations:

1. "Open enrollment" results in many new problems and challenges for the institutions because it increases not only the size of the student body, but also the diversity of students.
2. "Open enrollment" is relatively expensive because it requires compensatory programs with special supportive services, requires a wider range

of course offerings and facilities, and increases the number of the State's youth ready, willing, and able to participate in higher education on all levels.

3. The individual institutions will find it extremely difficult to continue to extend significant educational opportunities through "open enrollment" unless the State of Connecticut provides the additional funds for compensatory programs and other special requirements. Therefore, a coordinated State-wide plan should be developed as soon as possible.

4. Many of the State's youth have not been taking full advantage of the existing educational opportunities because of a lack of knowledge about them. Therefore, it is recommended that the Commission for Higher Education sponsor workshops on a regular basis and develop other appropriate means to disseminate information about existing and planned educational opportunities in Connecticut to secondary school personnel and to the youth.

V. CONCLUSION

During the course of Task Force II meetings on the study of function, scope, and structure of higher education in Connecticut, issues arose that have not been directly addressed in the preceding pages or possibly were given less emphasis than is warranted. Some of these are now briefly noted with the explanatory comment that their treatment by Task Force II is not a reflection of their importance but rather a function of the need to set some priorities in carrying out a mission of this magnitude.

It is clear that cooperation should be developed between all institutions of higher education, public and private, as well as other institutions to facilitate resource sharing. Prohibitive costs and the increasingly regional nature of educational regional needs call for sharing library facilities and services, computerized information storage and retrieval systems, faculty, and for continued development of higher education regional complexes or centers.

The previously mentioned recommendation for an institutional mission study is not made simply with an eye toward cost effectiveness or systems efficiency. Rather, it is strongly felt that where program imbalances exist either within institutions or in the system as a whole, such imbalances should be addressed in the interests of improving responsiveness to State needs and capitalizing on institutional capability.

Similarly, decisions made about which institutions should offer particular programs and at what levels should not allow connotations of inferiority or diminished importance to obtain where any particular program is concerned. The higher education system should not be seen as a hierarchy but rather as

circular where entry and reentry points are important only insofar as they are appropriate to and serve the needs of citizens.

Clearly, innovations must have an important place in making feasible such a system. Television, flexible school calendars, programs to identify "masked" talents, credit by exam -- to name but a few -- will have to be considered in future planning of higher education in Connecticut.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Academy for Educational Development, Inc.; National Planning For Education; New York, June, 1970

State Planning For Higher Education; New York, December, 1969

Cox, Lanier and Harrell, Lester E.; The Impact of Federal Programs on State Planning and Coordination of Higher Education; Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, 1969

Furse, Bernarr S., and Wright, Lyle O. (eds.); Comprehensive Planning in State Education Agencies; Mercury Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1968

Glenny, Lyman A., Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination; McCraw Hill, New York 1959

Palola, Ernest G.; Lehman, Timothy; Blischke, William R.; Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning; Center For Research and Development in Higher Education; Berkeley, 1970

ARTICLES AND PAPERS

Arrowsmith, William; "Idea of a New University;" The Center Magazine, March/April, 1970

Berdahl, Robert O.; "Private Higher Education and State Governments;" Educational Record, Summer, 1970

Colorado Commission on Higher Education; "Coordination, Planning, and Governance of Higher Education in Colorado;" Denver, 1969

Commission For Higher Education; "Goals For Higher Education;" Hartford, 1970

Glenny, Lyman A.; "Doctoral Planning For the Seventies: A Challenge to the States;" Opening Address, Meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board, Houston, June 11, 1970

"Institutional Autonomy For Whom?" American Association of Higher Education, March, 1970

Morton, Ben L.; "Perspective from a State Coordinator of Higher Education;" Educational Record, Summer, 1970